OE FORM 6000, 2/69

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

ERIC REPORT RESUME

ERIC ACC. NO.	P.A.	PUBL. DATE	ISSUE
ED 042 934			
CH ACC. NO. AA 000 617		Oct 70	RIEFEB71

IS DOCUMENT COPYRIGHTED? YES ☐ NO ☒
ERIC REPRODUCTION RELEASE? YES ☐ NO ☒
LEVEL OF AVAILABILITY I ☒ II ☐ III ☐

AUTHOR
Peterson, Richard E.

TITLE
The Crisis of Purpose: Definition and Uses of Institutional Goals.

SOURCE CODE	INSTITUTION (SOURCE)
BBB01751	
SP. AG. CODE	SPONSORING AGENCY

EDRS PRICE	CONTRACT NO.	GRANT NO.
0.25;0.85		
REPORT NO. R-5		BUREAU NO.

AVAILABILITY

JOURNAL CITATION

DESCRIPTIVE NOTE
15p.

DESCRIPTORS
*Higher Education; *Institutional Role; *Planning; *Objectives; *Research; Educational Philosophy

IDENTIFIERS
*Delphi Technique

ABSTRACT
This report considers what kinds of academic philosophies are being questioned and by whom. Some of the rhetoric concerning the purpose of higher education is reviewed, several conceptual distinctions are drawn, and working definitions are offered for such terms as "function," "purpose," "goal," and "objective." General and specific uses of institutional goals are discussed, and several multi-college studies on goals are described. Consideration of the issues of institutional autonomy and power is followed by attention to 3 strategies for determining goals: by fiat, by committee, and by survey. Special emphasis is given to the uses of the Delphi Technique as a goal-determination strategy. References follow the conclusions. (JS)

GPO 870-390

ED 042 934

THE CRISIS OF PURPOSE: DEFINITION AND USES OF INSTITUTIONAL GOALS

Richard E. Peterson

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Report 5

ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education
The George Washington University
1 Dupont Circle, Suite 630
Washington, D.C. 20036
October 1970

AA 000 617

FOREWORD

The ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education, one of a network of clearinghouses established by the U.S. Office of Education, is concerned with undergraduate, graduate, and professional education. As well as abstracting and indexing significant current documents in its field, the Clearinghouse prepares its own and commissions outside works on various aspects of higher education.

The issue of roles and purposes of colleges and universities has been intensely debated both on and off campus in recent years. In this paper, Richard E. Peterson, Research Psychologist at the Educational Testing Service, Berkeley, discusses the arguments and presents some of the methods for determining and using institutional goals. Critical reviews of an earlier draft of the paper were provided by Abraham Carp, Patricia Cross, and Warren Martin.

Carl J. Lange, *Director*
ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education
October 1970

This publication was prepared pursuant to a contract with the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their judgment in professional and technical matters. Points of view or opinions do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

When a man does not know what harbor he is making for, no wind is the right wind.

Seneca

This paper will not dwell in any detail on the agonies of American higher education during the past decade. It has been a time of fierce demands on the university to assume new roles, a time when financial resources have been found to be limited, and a time when public confidence and support in the wake of campus violence have slipped away. In attempting to accommodate new demands, academic communities have been left divided and demoralized as perhaps never before. Prospects for common understandings about the role of the university in American life seem hopelessly distant. This dilemma and the staggering events of the spring of 1970–Cambodia, Kent State, Jackson State, pronouncements from official Washington–have propelled the academic community into an unprecedented "crisis of purpose."

In dealing with institutional goals, this paper first considers what kinds of policies and philosophies are being questioned and by whom. Some of the rhetoric of higher education purpose is reviewed, several conceptual distinctions drawn, and working definitions offered for such terms as "function," "purpose," "goal," and "objective." A number of both general and specific institutional uses for institutional goals are discussed, and several multi-college studies of goals are described. Consideration of the issues of institutional autonomy and power is followed by attention to three strategies for determining goals–by fiat, by committee, and by survey. Special emphasis is given to the uses of the Delphi Technique as a goal-determination strategy.

What and Whose Goals

The concept of an "institutional goal" is just that–a concept, a verbal abstraction, and little more. But, as a conceptual tool it can be enormously useful in deliberating, determining, and evaluating policy and practice in education. What should a given university try to do? Educate the able, or educate the masses? Teach the wisdom of the ages or prepare youths for the job market? Conduct research on any topic for which funds are available? Render services to any agency in the corporate or government establishments? Sponsor partisan political action? Sponsor ROTC training? Or, from the standpoint of contemporary campus political realities, *whose* goals should the institution embrace–those of older tradition oriented professors, of research and discipline obsessed faculty, of radical students, of conservative trustees? On many campuses, these and many more formal and informal interest groups hold widely divergent and often conflicting views of the role of the institution. What are the implications of such division for the well-being of the college? Can a modicum of internal consensus about institutional mission *ever* be expected in the multiversity? What are the prospects for such an institution in a time of limited resources?

Fortunately, all institutions need not respond to the changing times in the same way. American higher education is not a monolith; indeed the diversity or pluralism within the total system is often regarded as its genius. But, as F. Champion Ward (Niblett, 1970) has noted, diverse colleges must be able to articulate their unique goals in ways meaningful to their constituencies and other supporters if they are to expect continuation of support necessary for their survival.

Colleges, however, have generally not become self-conscious about their potentially unique values and goals (beyond catalogue platitudes), often for reasons that are painfully obvious. Warren Martin (1969), for example, has pointed out that the "vacuum of purpose" has been filled by substantial conformity to the "superinstitutional standard of professionalism." While the guild orientation of the faculty is certainly one important factor, there are a host of more subtle considerations that will need to be faced and overcome by the college seriously seeking to articulate an institutional philosophy.

Jacques Barzun (1968) likened the American university to a "firehouse on the corner" that responds to any and all requests for assistance. For many years, with faithful public support, this was a role the university seemed to accept; institutions simply added new functions to existing ones. The academic bull-market, however, may have about run its course. Financial resources seem to have reached limits of availability, educational costs have risen to new heights, and various external constituencies press institutions to evaluate their effectiveness and account for their expenditure of public and private funds. Yet demands continue to be made on institutions to assume new functions and create new programs, and therein lie the elements of the "collision course" in higher education that David Riesman (1969) and others have warned of–the crunch of new demands against limited resources.

The point is that institutions will increasingly be forced to choose among alternative emphases and priorities. Engaging in urban, environmental, space science, or mortuary

studies, for example, will necessitate cutting back on something else. Colleges can also embrace new commitments while retaining old ones. They can, for example, respond to demands for political involvement by allowing students and staff time off before national elections. On what basis should an institution make such decisions?

The Rhetoric

Rather than attempt to review the history of thought on the aims of education, I will merely try to pull together several important threads in the evolution of American higher education which still find expression in contemporary understandings of college purposes. In the eighteenth century, colleges came into being chiefly to educate miniscule elites for positions of leadership in the existing establishment. Throughout the nineteenth century, a host of "special interest" colleges, as Jencks and Riesman (1968) called them, were created to serve the interests of various religious, occupational, and social class groups. Many of these eventually evolved into self-styled "liberal arts" colleges. The great watershed came in 1862 with the Morrill Act; the land grant colleges were established to provide publicly supported, secular, practical, vocational education for "the industrial classes," and public service. The last major thread was the importation during the last half of the century of the German concept of the university as a center for specialized scientific research and scholarship.

It is now, therefore, conventional wisdom to ascribe three broad purposes to the modern American university: teaching, research, and public service (although PhD-granting universities account for only 250 or so of the some 2500 institutions of higher education in the country).

Some 350 colleges and universities are controlled by the Roman Catholic Church. "One of the major dilemmas of Catholic higher education," writes Andrew Greeley (1969), is that it is "seeking the same objectives that the rest of American higher education seeks, [while] also . . . pursuing objectives which are uniquely its own." Greeley provides some catalogue excerpts, which are further excerpted here:

> It is the aim and purpose of_____College to assist students in the attainment of the highest perfection of intellect and will of which they are capable, in order that their earthly life may be spent in the service of God and man, their eternal life in the blessed and complete happiness of union with God in heaven. The College is devoted to helping each young woman develop herself as a person and as a Christian.

Some 450 colleges are affiliated with one or another Protestant denomination. They range in religious stance from tightly fundamental to highly liberal. The strength of the ties varies greatly from college to college. While the clear trend over the years has been toward a weakening of denominational ties, many continue to "keep the faith," as the following catalogue excerpts suggest:

> _____College desires to assist each student in the realization that "the fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom."

> The founding ideal of_____is to provide young men and women of the twentieth century the opportunity to investigate truth from the position that all areas of true knowledge and divine revelation are compatible.

It is, of course, quite impossible to do justice to the assemblage of rhetoric on the purpose of "liberal arts education." Much of the more recent outpouring may be a natural response, as Daniel Bell acknowledges (1966) to the somewhat embattled condition of the liberal arts tradition in the US, pressed as it is by populist and vocational forces, advanced programs in the high schools, and demands for graduate preparation and academic professionalism. Indeed, Jencks and Riesman speak of the "university college" as the key consequence of the "academic revolution." All this said, the goals of liberal arts colleges are commonly couched in terms of mastery of a basic cultural heritage together with development of intellectual values and styles, aesthetic sensitivity, and attitudes of social and moral responsibility. For example:

> _____College exists for the purpose of shaping the character of each of its students. It seeks to cultivate both intellectual and moral qualities . . .

> To free the student's mind: to arouse his intellectual curiosity, to free him to think independently and without the distortion of prejudice . . .

> For it is our desire to evoke, wherever possible, the outpouring of the creative spirit in art, literature, music, theatre, and dance.

The scores of public four-year colleges around the country, while giving lip service to the purposes of the liberal arts, are primarily in the business of vocational and pre-professional training, particularly of teachers. Spokesmen (e.g., Gleazer, 1968) for the public junior colleges–of which there are currently some 700 enrolling one-third to one-half of all freshmen and sophomores in the country–generally indicate that these institutions exist to provide: (1) terminal technical and vocational training, (2) the first two years of training for students transferring to four-year institutions, and (3) a range of public services for individuals and agencies in the local community.

Finally there is a variety of specialized institutions, such as technical institutes, theological schools, and art colleges, whose purposes are more narrowly drawn:

> The primary purpose of the undergraduate school of_____, as stated by the Trustees, is "to provide a collegiate education which will best train the creative type of scientist or engineer so urgently needed in our educational, governmental, and industrial development."

Most of the analytic (and hortatory) writing about various purposes of higher education, as would be expected, have centered on the student and on what ways the college should try to change him. Perhaps the most influential theme new in the past decade, articulated and consistently defended by the psychologist Nevitt Sanford (1962; in Niblett, 1970), holds that "the major aim of institutions of higher learning" is "the full development of the individual as a person" (1970, p. 9), with the stress on the affective and attitudinal as opposed to the intellectual side of human development (see also The Hazen Foundation, 1968). The lone voice for a purely intellectual and aggressively non-vocational conception of higher education seems to be Robert Hutchins' (*Chronicle*, 1970).

Much less has been written in recent years about the research function as such. Useful critical analyses have been provided by the late Lyle Spencer (Dobbins and Lee, 1968) and Carl Kaysen (1969); and John Perry Miller (Lawrence et al., 1970) has recently provided an analysis of the outputs of graduate schools.

Similarly, there are few contemporary treatments of the broad public service role. Those known to the author include Mayhew (1969) and Brandl (Lawrence et al., 1970). Instead, a more narrow and more activist view of public service has emerged which considers the university an instrument of social change (e.g., the papers in Minter and Thompson, 1968), with special reference to the city (Kerr, 1968; Mayhew, 1969). A related trend is the notion of the university as social critic (e.g., Keniston in Dobbins and Lee, 1968, and Luria and Luria, 1970).

Some Working Definitions

The words "function," "purpose," "goal," "objective," and the like, appear repeatedly in the rhetoric of higher education. It may be useful at this point to set forth several working definitions and conceptual distinctions.

Higher education *functions* refer to activities of the university or higher education system that are functionally related to other social institutions. Such functions have evolved over time generally without conscious intent. They are the variously identified activities of higher education as one social institution within a larger social system. Some examples would include: socialization of the young into adult society (college as an interim or "moratorium" between adolescence and adulthood); transmission of the cultural heritage; provision of trained manpower for the corporate establishment; certification for entry into the professions; provision of a means for social mobility, of a "sanctuary for scholars" (Wolff, 1969), and of a custodial or babysitting service.

Purposes in higher education refer to stated conceptions of the mission of systems, groups, or types of colleges. Thus, we can speak of the purposes of American higher education, the liberal arts college, or the California junior colleges. Purposes in the public higher education sector are usually politically determined by coalitions and trade-offs of interest within and external to the system in question. (For an illuminating account of this process in statewide systems, see Palola, 1970).

Goals will refer to the particular, possibly unique pattern of specified ends, outputs, and priorities established for a single college or university. These are the institutional goals that are the concern of this paper. Like system purposes, when new institutional goals are set, it is generally through a political rather than a more deliberate or rational process. At many established colleges, of course, goals were laid down at the time the institution was founded, and they may not have changed appreciably over the years. While the determination of goals may still turn heavily on politics in the relatively autonomous private colleges, the range of interested parties there would ordinarily be limited to those in the campus community. Hence, at these colleges, the process of defining goals may be somewhat more amenable to rationality.

I use the word *objective* in speaking about the ends of various component units, programs, and services. Thus the academic planner (or program evaluator) might speak of "program objectives"; department chairmen and professors, of "course objectives"; a residence hall advisor, of the objectives of the student personnel division. In contrast to the other kinds of ends, determination of program objectives is primarily the task of the relevant academic professionals, with little "outside" influence. Program objectives, however, would be expected to be roughly consistent with institutional goals.

Conceptual Distinctions

In addition to these four definitions, it should also be helpful to take note of the following four conceptual distinctions drawn mainly by sociologists interested in organization theory.

The distinction between *output and support goals* (Gross and Grambsch, 1968) is between those "which are manifested in a product of some kind (output goals). . . and those which are the ends of persons responsible for the maintenance activities . . . of the organization" (support goals). In the university, the former

> involve the usual goals of teaching, research and community service . . . [the latter] involve a variety of activities designed to help the organization survive in its environment, those that ensure that the university is run in desired ways, those designed to ensure motivated participation, and those designed to ensure the university's position in the population of universities (Gross, 1968).

Official goals have been contrasted with *operative* goals by Charles Perrow (1961). Official goals

> are the general purposes . . . as put forth in the charter, annual reports, public statements by key executives, and other authoritative pronouncements [such as the college catalogue, while] operative goals designate the ends sought through the actual operating policies of the organization; they tell us what the organization actually is trying to do, regardless of what the official goals say are the aims.

Amitai Etzioni (1964) makes approximately the same distinction, using the words *stated* and *real* goals. Operative goals bear no necessary relation to official goals; the former, says Perrow, "may support, be irrelevant to, or subvert official goals." Various analysts (Perrow; Etzioni; Price, 1968; Churchman, 1968) have pointed out the relative difficulty of identifying the operative or real goals of an organization.

In writing some years ago about educational objectives, Sanford (1962) distinguished between *minimal* goals, such as simply moving students through to the BA, and *maximal* goals, that might involve helping students to realize their full creative potentials. Conceivably, this distinction could apply to other kinds of college goals–for example, in the area of public service, a college might work with public agencies to reduce stream pollution to some minimally acceptable level or the goal might be to beautify the watershed.

While neither *organizational* nor *special interest* or *individual* goals are distinctions between kinds of institutional goals, both are meaningful in the university setting. In an analysis of administrative planning in education, André Danière (Elam and Swanson, 1969) commented on the role of self-styled (or formally designated) representatives of special interests–the poor, an ethnic group, "victims of heartless bureaucracies," and so forth. In a time of factionalism and collective bargaining on the campus, there is seldom much secrecy about divergent "special interest" objectives of various constituent groups (cf. Baughman in Johnson and Katzenmeyer, 1969; Peterson, 1969; *Campus Tensions,* 1970). The distinction between *organizational* and *individual* goals is one that almost all organization theorists call attention to. In the university, an obvious example of conflict between these two types of goals involves the professor whose individual goals (or motives, in the language of the psychologist), e.g., career aspirations, often clash with institutional aims.

Some Uses of Institutional Goals

In this section, a number of ways that clear conceptions of institutional goals may be put to use on the campus are set forth. Some of the uses of institutional goals such as the first two examples in the following discussion are fairly general; the others are more specific. This listing is certainly not exhaustive, and the various entries are not independent either in the abstract or in practice.

As fundamentals of policy. As suggested toward the beginning, a conception of institutional goals may serve as the basic element in a formulation of the institution's policy, philosophy, or ideology. Stated goals help tie together assumptions, values, and hopes for the institution into a coherent policy that then provides standards and guides for present and future college decisions and actions. A policy formulation containing clearly enunciated goals also enables individuals and agencies outside the campus–prospective students and staff, governmental units, funding agencies, etc.–to be clear about the college's raison d'etre and what can be expected of it.

As general decision guides. A policy-as-goals statement, especially if democratically conceived and widely understood in the college community, should serve the entire community as a framework for reaching decisions, solving problems, allocating resources, and accordingly ordering actions in certain directions. The goals can be used as standards for decision making by all campus groups–by the trustees, for example, in approving architect's plans for the new student union, by department chairmen in recruiting faculty, by students considering revisions to the judiciary code, by the business office in selecting office furniture, and so forth. Day-to-day work of students and staff would be expected to become more oriented toward the institutional goals; gaps between official and operative, and between organizational and individual goals would be reduced.

In planning. As higher education institutions and systems have had to cope with expanding enrollments and, now, with limited resources, they have been forced to engage in some sort of planning, be it crude or fairly systematic, short or long term. The importance of establishing goals in the planning process has come to be universally recognized in both educational (Elam and Swanson, 1969) and non-educational settings (Churchman, 1968). Commenting on planning in higher education, Alvin Eurich observed that "clarifying goals and establishing priorities among them are the first order of business in managing the future" (Eurich, 1969). Planning in higher education, of course, goes on at many levels, and consciousness of goals, it may be argued, is critical at all of them: in futuristic thinking about national and international systems, in developing state-wide master plans, in restructuring existing systems (including fashioning new governance systems), in planning Siwash's next five years, in year-to-year budgeting in single institutions and their various component units.

The use of goals in financial planning is particularly relevant to the topic of this paper. In the past few years, there has been a dramatic infusion into higher education of various public finance analysis and management methods, of which perhaps the best known goes by the letters PPBS (planning-program-budgeting-system). An important element in PPBS and PPBS-like methods is

identification of goals or "outputs" (the economists' preferred term). Various planners, however, point to the very great difficulty of developing usable conceptions of college goals. And PPBS, as one practitioner (Brandl in Lawrence et al., 1970) acknowledges, "does not provide a theory for deciding . . . what the outputs of higher education are."

In management information systems. Also a response to increasing university size and complexity, the management information system (MIS) is another new administrative tool currently enjoying considerable vogue. MISs have been developed to provide decision makers with relevant and timely data, use of which presumably leads to better decisions. Like the more general planning process, MISs require "specification of goals and objectives of the system." Ben Lawrence, director of the WICHE[1] MIS program, and the other editors of a recent state-of-the-art review point out that "a management information system calls for the clear explication of objectives and the exposé of the processes by which the objectives are reached" (Minter and Lawrence, 1969). Lawrence (1969) contends that "systems designed to respond to questions within the context of overall goals . . . must be developed." Johnson and Katzenmeyer, editors of yet another MIS state-of-the-art book (1969), echo the necessity for goal specification and then go on to voice a measure of despair over its achievement.

> [Ben Lawrence] has outlined an approach for improving decision making . . . Since such models have as a fundamental prerequisite the clear statement of institutional objectives, the development of these objectives is particularly critical to the approach outlined. The extreme difficulty of specifying even general objectives in most institutions of higher education is apparent to those who have attempted the task.

In institutional evaluation. In response to some of the pressures already alluded to, including a mandate from Washington to assess outcomes of federally funded programs, the field of "educational evaluation" has grown into a new professional specialty with a developing set of principles and techniques all its own. Evaluation is commonly understood as a process of information gathering focused on the extent to which an educational program is achieving predetermined objectives. Evaluation information is fed to educational managers either (or both) during the course of the program or at its termination; in either event, the purpose is to improve the program or maximize program objectives.

The literature of educational evaluation is extremely voluminous. Two convenient entry points are Tyler (1969) and Denny (1970). Sociologist Edward Suchman has provided a particularly comprehensive treatment of evaluation, with applications in settings other than educational ones. He puts "identification of the goals to be evaluated" first in a list of steps "essential for evaluation" (Suchman, 1967).

For the most part, educational evaluation has taken place in elementary and secondary schools and has focused on specific courses or programs. Systematic evaluation, however, can be extended to an institution's total educational program, and it is already taking hold in higher education. Many universities have institutional research offices; there is a nationally organized Association for Institutional Research (AIR); a number of consortia of colleges have been formed to promote cooperative institutional research; and a range of assessment instruments are available (e.g., *The Institutional Research Program for Higher Education,* 1970).

The work of sociologists interested in organizations may provide a measure of conceptual assistance. Their key concept is "effectiveness," which is usually defined as "the degree of goal-achievement," so that "determination of an organization's goal(s) is crucial in evaluating effectiveness" (Price, 1968). Etzioni distinguishes between "effectiveness" and "efficiency" as follows:

> Organizations are constructed to be the most effective and efficient social units. The actual effectiveness of a specific organization is determined by the degree to which it realizes its goals. The efficiency of an organization is measured by the amount of resources used to produce a unit of output.

In implementing accountability. "Accountability" is another concept gaining popularity in educational administration circles, especially, so far, in lower rather than higher education. The meaning of accountability in relation to education is as yet not entirely clear. Leon Lessinger, observes (1970) that:

> Too frequently, educational managers attempt to explain their activities in terms of resources and processes used, rather than learning results achieved. These explanations are no longer adequate . . . The public is demanding "product reliability" in terms of student capabilities and no longer will accept assertions of professional superiorities in educational matters.

And he goes on to say that,

> In its most basic aspect, the concept of educational accountability is a process designed to insure that any individual can determine for himself if the schools are producing the *results promised* (italics mine) . . . Like most processes that involve a balancing of inputs and outputs, educational accountability can be implemented successfully only if educational objectives are clearly stated before instruction starts.

The distinction between evaluation and "accountability-implementation" is also unclear. Accountability seems to be concerned more with results and less with process or

---

[1]Western Interstate Commission on Higher Education (P.O. Drawer P, Boulder, Colorado)

means; it has more to do with finances and efficiency; tends to be more of a public operation (like an audit by an external agency); and carries a greater implication of finality—of hard judgments about total programs—in contrast to attempts to modify continuing programs. The prospects for this sort of accountability may seem distant for most colleges. At least one university administrator (David Brown in Lawrence et al., 1970), however, regards accountability as an inescapable "imperative."

Research on Goals

In that seminal volume, *The American College*, Nevitt Sanford (1962) emphasized that

> objectives can be studied . . . that goals ought to be the objects of continuing study . . . it is one of our tasks to study these goals, discovering what we can do about . . . their origins . . . means through which they may be reached and their consequences . . . [and] who has what desires in what times and circumstances.

Sanford's hopes have been only partially fulfilled. There has been rather little research by social scientists on the topic of higher education purposes, and that which has been done has dealt chiefly with college goals as they are perceived by different groups, with little or no attention given to real or operative goals, or the "origin and consequences" of institutional goals. Two recent exceptions are Martin (1969), and Keeton and Hilberry (1969), in which the authors give historical perspective on the philosophy and goals of each of the institutions studied.

Six empirical multi-college studies that have focused either exclusively or partly on institutional goals are summarized below. The reader will be struck by the disparity between the utterances of educational statesmen and catalogue statements (noted previously), on the one hand, and the results of the various surveys, on the other.

The work of Edward Gross and Paul Grambsch (1968) easily stands as the most significant empirical effort thus far to examine the nature and structure of university goals—goals as they existed in 1964 in the minds of faculty and administrators at 68 nondenominational PhD-granting universities in the country. Gross and Grambsch used an inventory consisting of 47 goal statements, of which 17 dealt with "output" goals (preparing students, doing research, providing public service) and the rest with "support" goals (holding staff, involving faculty in university governance, etc.). Respondents rated the goal statements in two ways—in terms of (1) how important each "is" at the respondent's university, and (2) how important the goal "should be" at his university. Based on 51% and 40% return rates for faculty and administrators, the seven top-ranked "is" goals for the two groups combined were:

1. Protect the faculty's right to academic freedom.
2. Increase or maintain the prestige of the university.
3. Maintain top quality in those programs felt to be especially important.
4. Ensure the continued confidence and hence support of those who contribute substantially to the finances and other material resource needs of the university.
5. Keep up to date and responsive.
6. Train students in methods of scholarship and/or scientific research and/or creative endeavor.
7. Carry on pure research.

Generally, differences between faculty and administrator rankings were small; "is" and "should be" perceptions varied substantially (although ". . . academic freedom" led both lists); and there was a relative lack of importance attached to student-related goals. On the "should be" rankings, item 6 above appeared as item 2, and a statement reading "Produce a student who has his intellect cultivated to the maximum" was ranked number 3. Eighteen of the 47 goal statements referred directly to students.

In a second study, a group from the Bureau of Applied Social Research at Columbia University (Nash, 1968) sent a form containing 64 goal statements to the academic dean of every college in the country. The deans indicated the extent to which their college "emphasized" each goal. In general, the results demonstrated the fact that different goals existed for different types of institutions, although some goal statements were "strongly emphasized" universally—e.g., "to improve the quality of instruction," and "to increase the number of books in the library." Through factor analysis, the goals were found to be interrelated in such a way that five broad "goal structures" (factors) could be identified. They were labeled: Orientation toward Research and Instruction, Orientation toward Instrumental Training, Orientation toward Social Development of Students, Democratic Orientation (participatory campus governance), and Orientation toward Development of Resources (physical expansion).

Analysis of college goals was one aspect of the Project on Student Development conducted by and at 13 of the member colleges of the Council for Advancement of Small Colleges. All faculty and administrators ranked 25 stated characteristics of graduates (e.g., "Competent in both oral and written communications," "Guided by God's will") in terms of "importance for the graduates of your institution." On the basis of the results, the project staff was able to divide the 13 colleges into four categories: Christ-Centered, Intellectual-Social, Personal-Social, and Professional-Vocational (Chickering, 1968).

In a study sponsored by the Danforth Foundation (1969), the Gross and Grambsch questionnaire was revised for application to private liberal arts colleges. The form was administered to the administrators, a 20% sample of faculty, and 100 students, at 13 private liberal arts colleges and one private junior college. It was found that: (1) great emphasis is placed upon teaching and student-

oriented activities and there is a lack of emphasis on research and research-related activities; (2) there is significant agreement among administrators, faculty, and students on most matters relating to college goals and governance; (3) marked differences exist between perceived goals and preferred goals[2] although administrators, faculty, and students share common views on many of the desired changes; (4) governance revolves around the administrators to a very large extent.

In his questionnaire and interview study of "institutional character" in eight colleges and universities, Warren Martin (1969) found that generally there was little serious concern about institutional goals, although there were substantial differences in this regard between newer, innovative colleges and older, more conventional institutions. Seventy-three percent of the faculty respondents at the innovative colleges, compared with six percent at the conventional universities in the sample, reported that institutional objectives were discussed at length when they considered joining the faculty. Forty percent of the total faculty sample reported that the emphasis in recruiting was clearly on the work of the department; 16% said institutional goals were emphasized. Entering students were found to know little about their college's philosophy. Martin discusses some of the reasons for lack of interest in institutional goals on the campuses: preoccupation with professional guilds among the faculty, preoccupation with day-to-day problems and pressures, and feelings of futility about ever achieving real closure regarding institutional goals.

Autonomy and Locus of Power

Before describing and commenting upon three strategies for defining or redefining goals, the critical assumption of institutional autonomy needs to be considered. If a college community, in the belief that it is the master of its own ship, labors in good faith toward a new conception of college aims only to find that it is not, and perhaps never has been, its own master, all the passions that led to the movement for goal reformulation in the first place will be re-ignited. Thus a college that has serious intentions of redefining institutional goals must first determine whether it indeed has the power to redefine its directions and then to act accordingly. These observations are made in the light of the trend toward deference to higher authorities by more and more colleges. The question of autonomy is particularly important in the public sector with the proliferation of statewide coordinating bodies and master plans, together with seemingly hardening orthodoxies about what certain kinds of colleges are supposed to do.

In some localities, conflicts about locus of power seem to be moving toward crises of the greatest consequence. In California, for example, the Regents of the University of California legally have ultimate power over the nine UC campuses. Nonetheless, during May of 1970, in the wake of Cambodia and Kent State, aroused students and faculty effected a substantial redefinition of the University, at least of its teaching/learning function. As this paper is being written, plans are under way to try to ensure that the Berkeley campus, when it reopens in the fall, remains in some degree "reconstituted." It is clear that in certain places established power relationships are under heavy attack by local campus forces, rendering familiar understandings about what powers reside where less meaningful than they once were.

These remarks about conflict over ultimate authority apply to some extent to the private sector of higher education as well, although typically such conflict would take different and less extreme forms. Church-related colleges certainly are subordinate to higher authoriti outside the campus. Nonetheless, one suspects in the absence of data, that it is somewhat easier at church-related colleges for local campus people to initiate a redefinition of mission: these institutions are smaller and more homogeneous; higher authorities have less basis in civil law, and there would not be opportunistic politicians close by to marshall off-campus opinion or withhold public funds against redefinition. On the other hand, people attracted to the Catholic and Protestant colleges to study and teach are usually less inclined by temperament to engage in "radical" or reformulation enterprises and, of course, the "effective" power of some forms of institutionalized religion may well be stronger than any secular-based power. On balance, though, some of the most creative and viable institutional goal reformulations down through the years have occurred at religiously affiliated colleges despite their original purposes.

Some 600 colleges and universities in the country are generally classified as "independent," which suggests an absence of formal ties to governmental, church, or corporate bodies. Of course, there *are* external constraints on these institutions as well, especially the will of financial supporters. For the college whose primary operative goal has been to "ensure confidence of contributors," any real redefinition of directions would depend on presidential (or trustee) resourcefulness in reassuring present donors and/or locating new "angels" to support the "new" college. One wonders how often dramatic change has occurred at colleges as a direct result of very large gifts of money, and in such cases, whether the nature of the change was specified by the donor, or developed by the college itself. The point is that the independent colleges—relatively free as they are from higher authority—*ought* to be in the best position to embark on wholesale institutional redefinition, either on their own initiative or in response to some private stimulus.

These comments about autonomy and locus of power are offered, first, so that people on the campuses may be

---

[2]With data pooled across colleges, "Ensure confidence of contributors" was viewed as the most important existing goal by both faculty and students; as a preferred goal, it was ranked 22 and 36 by faculty and students, respectively (in a field of 50 goal statements).

mindful from the beginning of certain realities in order to prevent their policy-making efforts from coming to nought, and, second, to remind higher education planners, especially in the public sector, that in many localities the rhetoric of "institutional autonomy" and "power to the people" are no longer empty slogans.

Strategies

Needless to say, a host of different strategies have been used by colleges seeking to clarify, define, or redefine their goals. Three general patterns of goal determination are identified and discussed here–by fiat, by committee, and by survey.

By fiat. Undoubtedly, institutional goals can be "determined" in an entirely arbitrary manner–by a board of trustees and/or a powerful president and/or administrative or faculty clique–quite without regard for the views of the majority of students and staff. Policy is thus promulgated with the expectation that students and staff: (1) actively accept the formulation; (2) don't care (perform their roles ritualistically); or (3) leave the college. I presume goal determination by fiat to be a relative rarity in today's academic world, which is not to say that many colleges do not function under a tradition perpetuated by essentially arbitrary actions.

By committee. A way to avoid charges of arbitrariness is to establish a committee; and, indeed, use of committees is undoubtedly the most characteristic way academic enclaves deal with nonroutine matters. More than likely, a faculty committee on college aims (probably a standing one) or a student/faculty/trustee committee on goals exists now on the majority of campuses. In writing about mechanics for defining goals, Alvin Eurich (1969) suggests:

> an institutionwide committee on goals, chaired by the president, the academic vice-president, or the dean of the faculty. The committee should be relatively small, certainly no more than fifteen at the outset, including representation of . . . trustees, administrators, faculty, students, ancillary staff, constituents, alumni, community, and cooperating institutions. The efforts of this group should be directed toward a definite statement of the particular kind of institution that the committee envisions ten to twenty years hence.

In a recent issue of *Science*, there appeared a provocative statement on "Purpose and Function of the University" written by a faculty Interdisciplinary Studies Committee on the Future of Man at the University of Wisconsin (Potter et al., 1970). The Committee was critical of recently adopted (by the faculty) statements of institutional mission, as well as of much of the ongoing work of the University, arguing that they were too heavily oriented toward present conditions and problems. It was also critical of University allegiance to the "search for truth" in the abstract, and recommended that the search for truth become "future-oriented." The Committee proposed that:

> The primary purpose of the University
> Is to provide an environment
> In which faculty and students
> Can discover, examine critically,
> Preserve, and transmit
> The knowledge, wisdom, and values
> That will help ensure the survival
> Of the present and future generations
> With improvement in the quality of life.

The Wisconsin group ended its article with the note that:

> the faculty unanimously approved [the Committee document] as "an appropriate and timely supplement to previous statements of University purpose and function" and specifically endorsed the statement of primary purpose.

Reading about the Wisconsin committee's apparent success in giving new focus to the institution's mission brings to mind a number of questions about goal determination by committee. How, one wonders, have other goals committees on other campuses around the country fared? Why don't more accounts like the Wisconsin one find the light of the day? Are committee chairmen or committee report writers often either too timid or too embarrassed by their efforts to make them public? If so, why? Is it because their statements are couched in such banalities or platitudes that no one could disagree and no sense of institutional distinctiveness is communicated? Or because there are campus groups that reject the new goal formulation in total or part and who would make the issue public? (Black students and staff, for example, might feel a bit uneasy about their institution opting for the future rather than the present.)

Can a committee of 15, or even of 50, expect to represent all shades of campus opinion, even of faculty opinion? How many campus goals committees are appointed by the college president? When committees are deliberately comprised of representatives of diverse constituent groups, where does the "effective" power lie?

How many committees hold hearings or otherwise attempt to bring together the very best thinking available in the campus community? Indeed, how many have the funds and released time to do so? To what extent are committee products "ego-trips" of their chairmen, other committee members, or representatives of special interests? In short, normal committee functioning may be faulted on the twin grounds of insufficient democratic participation and insufficient rationality–the fact that all interested parties do not have equal opportunity to have their views heard, and that all relevant ideas are not systematically secured and then impartially weighed.

By survey. A number of academic and nonacademic organizations have experimented with questionnaire survey techniques in an attempt to realize better the principles of participation and rationality in long-range planning. The prototype method is what is called the Delphi Technique, which was invented in the early 1950s

by Olaf Helmer and his colleagues at the Rand Corporation (Helmer, 1966). The Delphi procedure may be described as follows:

1. Participants are asked to list their opinions on a specific topic, such as recommended activities or predictions for the future.

2. Participants are then asked to evaluate the total list against some criterion, such as importance, chance of success, etc.

3. Each participant receives the list and a summary of responses to the items and, if in the minority, is asked to revise his opinion or indicate his reason for remaining in the minority.

4. Each participant again receives the list, an updated summary of responses, a summary of minority opinions, and a final chance to revise his opinions.

Thus the Delphi method has the potential for providing an institution with:

1. a range of ideas about goals

2. priority rankings of the goals

3. a degree of consensus about goals[3]

Two instances of the use of Delphi-like procedures in higher education have recently been reported (Norton, 1970; Uhl, 1970). They are of interest here more for their logic and method, than for their substantive results. The first used the Delphi method of establishing goals in the early planning for a new public university; the second is a cooperative experimental and self-study project involving five established institutions.

Governors State University (GSU) was authorized in mid-1969 as a senior university to be located in the Chicago suburb of Park Forest. Designed to serve community college transfers, the University, in the words of its president, "is intended to be an innovative, future-oriented, and public service minded institution." Within this framework, President Engbretson was

> seeking opinions on better ways to use our educational potential in the belief that planning an institution such as Governors State University should reflect the best thinking of socially concerned individuals from government, education, business, industry and the arts–from the local to the national level (Norton, 1970).

[3]Helmer and others have shown that when an individual knows how others have responded, as well as reasons for nontypical responses, his own response will often change in the direction of the "norm."

The first step was to identify the groups whose opinions were judged to be relevant to the work of the institution. Thirty-three such groups were decided upon, including samples of staff and students at feeder junior colleges, members of various local, state, and national higher education organizations, local industrial leaders, and local civic groups. Step two was to send a one-page form to 1,185 individuals in the 33 groups, asking them to write out brief answers to six general questions about possible goals and roles for GSU. The questionnaire was accompanied by a cover letter from President Engbretson describing the broad GSU mandate and the use of the Delphi Technique in developmental planning.

Drawing on responses to the first mailing, a second instrument was constructed consisting of 50 short goal statements covering the range of ideas that had been suggested. Two sample statements were:

> to provide opportunities for advanced level adult continuing education
>
> to provide instruction in human relations and good government for all students

Step three was to send, two months after the first, the second inventory to the same (approximately) group of participants, asking them to give for each goal statement a "priority for GSU" rating using a five-point scale.

The fourth step of the general Delphi method was omitted because of time pressures, because it seemed unlikely that revisions would give additional information, and because there was no particular need for consensus on goals for GSU. Thus, it was an analysis of the data from the second instrument that was forwarded to the GSU planners, who were then in possession of an array of ideas concerning goals for the University and priority rankings (of 50 possible goals) provided by eleven constituent groups–combinations of the original 33 samples.

The second project, which involves a modified Delphi procedure and five diverse institutions in the Carolinas and Virginia, is currently nearing completion.[4] The purposes of the project are: (1) to test the usefulness of the Delphi Technique as a way of obtaining consensus (defined as opinion convergence) in regard to institutional goals and (2) to learn chiefly for purposes of institutional self-study, how diverse constituent groups on- and off-campus perceive the goals of the respective colleges.

In this study, the major departure from "standard" Delphi procedure was to omit the usual first step of asking respondents, in an open-ended fashion, to list ideas. Instead, step one entailed administering a previously prepared experimental Institutional Goals Inventory

[4]Directed by Norman Uhl of the Southeastern Office of Educational Testing Service, the project is sponsored by the Regional Education Laboratory of the Carolinas and Virginia, and is part of the Lab's ongoing effort to perfect its Administrative-Organization System model. Both the Lab and the ETS Office are in Durham, NC.

(IGI)[5] to some 1000 individuals spread across samples of undergraduates, graduates (where applicable), faculty, administrators, trustees, and alumni from the five institutions, plus samples from local political, occupational, religious, and minority racial groups. The instrument consisted of 105 statements covering all–and more–of the kinds of goals discussed earlier. Following the Gross and Grambsch (1968) method, respondents rated each item on a five-point "importance" scale in terms of both: (1) perceptions of the existing goal structure, and (2) what the institution's goals ought to be (i.e., "is" and "should be" responses). Eighty-five percent of the questionnaires were returned.

The second step was to distribute the same form to the same 1000 people, with two differences: the first was that the modal (calculated separately for each college and based on all respondents at or rating the college in question) "is" and "should be" responses for each item were indicated on the form; and, second, individuals who this time assigned a rating different from the step one modal rating were asked to explain briefly the reasons for their rating. Return rate for the second questionnaire was 80%.

The third step was a repeat of the second, with the exception that separate sheets containing a summary of minority opinions, (real, not contrived) for each goal statement for the institution in question accompanied the inventory. Thus, in step three, participants responded to the IGI knowing, for each item, both the modal response on the previous administration and the kinds of reasons people had for not giving the modal response. The return rate was 75%.

Data on how the various constituent groups understand the goals of the respective colleges have already been passed on to each college. Conclusions regarding whether there was any significant convergence in goal beliefs between the first and third questionnaire await completion of statistical analyses.

Conclusions

Institutional goal determination has two end-products: identification of goals, and establishment of priorities among the goals. An institution's "goal structure"–its rank-ordering of goals–can be said to be determined when some level of consensus has been reached through a process that is democratic and participatory. The goal determination process must be regarded universally on campus as fair if the resulting goal structure is to have legitimacy, if it is to be accepted as morally proper in the college community. For a useful modern treatment of the ideas of authority and legitimacy, see Schaar (1970).

---

[5]Planning for an IGI for use by colleges in self-study and goal-definition efforts has been continuing at ETS for some time. The items (goal statements) in the present IGI version were written in January 1970 by a group of ETS research psychologists and sociologists under the general direction of Uhl.

Whatever the specific mechanisms adopted may be, responsibility for setting the process in motion, for delineating the charge, and for dealing with the question of autonomy, lies with the chief campus administrator. Determination of college mission, in short, is a critical leadership function of the college president (cf. Walton, 1959; McConnell, 1968; Eurich, 1969).

Institutional goals would profitably be conceived of in terms of outcome goals and support goals. Outcome goals are the ends the college seeks to realize, and can refer to the desired characteristics of graduating seniors, kinds of research and development, kinds of public services, and so forth. These goals would be stated at about the level of specificity of the goal-statements used in the various studies mentioned (e.g., Gross and Grambsch, 1968; Norton, 1970). Once outcome goals have been determined, a necessary next task is to translate these conceptions into precise, measurable program objectives. The work of deriving specific objectives from the more general goals is the responsibility of the relevant professionals. Within the framework of the college's "goal-structure," the objectives of its School of Business, for example, would be set by School of Business people (including students), with substantial help from specialists in measurement, evaluation, and systems analysis. Arthur Cohen (1969) has provided some extremely valuable material on the logic and method of "defined outcome objectives." Brown (1970), in something of a tour-de-force, has outlined a notably complete model, consisting of goals, objectives, *and* measurement strategies.

Support goals are the goals which, when attained, facilitate reaching the outcome goals. They have to do with instructional resources, educational environment, and the like. In a sense, they are planning goals, such as doubling the library holdings, or the number of fine arts faculty; establishing a center for ecological studies or a remedial skills center. Support goals are intended to optimize the previously identified outcome goals.

The means of determining institutional goals might well involve both a committee-like task group and some form of opinion or values survey. The task group should include elected or volunteer representatives of campus constituent groups, including trustees (who presumably have encouraged the goal determination effort from the outset). An important job of the task group on goals, numbering about twelve members and chaired by the college president, is to organize, help plan and implement, and generally oversee a goals survey. The survey need not follow the Delphi procedure, or some variant. Arthur Chickering (1970), for example, has proposed several potentially useful sociometric and related techniques for generating ideas about goals. If survey activities are carefully planned and executed, faculty and others will take them seriously, as evidenced by the high return rates for Uhl's repeated survey. Once the survey is completed, the task group should conduct open hearings on the results, and eventually prepare a report setting forth a goals structure for the college.

It seems essential in these times that colleges articulate their goals: to give direction to present and future work; to provide an ideology that can nurture internal cooperation, communication and trust; to enable appraisal of the institution as a means-ends system; to afford a basis for public understanding and support. Indeed, the college without the inclination or will to define itself, to chart a course for itself, can look forward either to *no* future–to a kind of half-life of constantly responding to shifting pressures–or to a future laid down by some external authority. Neither prospect pleases.

REFERENCES

Astin, A. and Panos, R.J. "Evaluation of Education Programs." *Evaluation Measurement*, edited by R.L. Thorndike. Washington: American Council on Education, 1970.

Barzun, J. *The American University: How It Runs, Where It Is Going*. New York: Harper, 1968.

Beard, R.M. *Objectives in Higher Education*. London: Society for Research in Higher Education, Ltd., 1968.

Becker, E. *Beyond Alienation: A Philosophy of Education for the Crisis of Democracy*. New York: Braziller, 1967.

Bell, D. *The Reforming of General Education*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1966.

Betsky, S. "Concepts of Excellence: Universities in an Industrial Culture." *Universities Quarterly* 23, Winter 1969.

Blaug, M. "The Productivity of Universities." *Minerva* 6, Spring 1968.

Bloom, B.S., ed. *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives, Handbook I: Cognitive Domain*. New York: Longmans, Green, 1956.

Brubacher, J.S. *Bases for Policy in Higher Education*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1965.

Campus Tensions: Analysis and Recommendations. Report of the Special Committee on Campus Tensions. Washington: American Council on Education, 1970.

Case, H.L. "Declaration of Aims and Policies of University X." *Educational Record* 50, Fall 1969.

Chickering, A.W. *Education and Identity*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1968.

———— *Research for Action*. Mimeographed. Plainfield, Vt.: Union for Experimenting Colleges and Universities, 1970.

Churchman, C.W. *The System Approach*. New York: Dell, 1968.

Cohen, A. *Dateline '79*. New York: MacMillan, 1969.

Conway, Jill. "Styles of Academic Culture." *Daedalus* 99, Winter 1970.

Cook, D.L. *Program Evaluation and Review Technique Applications in Education*. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1966.

Denny, T., ed. "Educational Evaluation." *Review of Educational Research* 40, April 1970.

Dobbins, D.G. and Lee, C.B.T. eds. *Whose Goals for American Higher Education?* Washington: American Council on Education, 1968.

Dunham, E.A. *Colleges of the Forgotten Americans: A Profile of State Colleges and Regional Universities*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1969.

Dyer, H.S. "The Discovery and Development of Educational Goals." In *Proceedings of the 1966 Invitational Conference on Testing Problems*. Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1967.

Elam, S. and Swanson, G.I., eds. *Educational Planning in the United States*. Itasca, Ill.: Peacock, 1969.

Etzioni, A. *Modern Organizations*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1964.

Eurich, A.C. "Managing the Future: Some Practical Suggestions." In *The Future Academic Community*, edited by J. Caffrey. Washington: American Council on Education, 1969.

Froomkin, J. *Aspirations, Enrollments, and Resources; The Challenge to Higher Education in the Seventies*. Washington: Office of Education, Office of Program Planning and Evaluation Planning Paper 69-1, May, 1969.

Gardner, J.W. "National Goals in Education." In *Goals for Americans*. The President's Commission on National Goals. New York: Prentice Hall, 1960.

Gleazer, E.J., Jr. *This is the Community College*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1968.

Grambsch, P. "Conflicts and Priorities in Higher Education." Paper presented at AAHE's 25th National Conference on Higher Education, Chicago, March 2, 1970.

Greeley, A.M. *From Backwater to Mainstream: A Profile of Catholic Higher Education*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1969.

Gross, E. "Universities as Organizations: A Research Approach." *American Sociological Review* 33, August 1968.

Gross, E. and Grambsch, P.V. *University Goals and Academic Power*. Washington: American Council on Education, 1968.

Harvard University Committee on the Objectives of General Education in a Free Society. *General Education in a Free Society*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1945.

The Student in Higher Education. New Haven, Conn.: Hazen Foundation, 1968.

Helmer, O. *Social Technology*. New York: Basic Books, 1966.

Henderson, A.D. "Control in Higher Education: Trends and Issues." *Journal of Higher Education* 40, January 1969.

Hill, M. "A Goal Achievement Matrix for Evaluating Alternative Plans." *AIP Journal* 8, January 1968.

The Institutional Research Program for Higher Education. Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1970.

Jencks, C. and Riesman, D. *The Academic Revolution.* New York: Doubleday, 1968.

Jennings, F.G. "The Two-Year Stretch." *Change* 2, March-April 1970.

Johnson, C.B. and Katenzmeyer, W.G., eds. *Management Information Systems in Higher Education: The State of the Art.* Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1969.

Kaysen, C. *The Higher Learning, the Universities, and the Public.* Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1969.

Keeton, M.T. and Hilberry, C. "Liberal Arts Colleges: A Call to Leadership." *Journal of Higher Education* 39, October 1968.

_____. *Struggle and Promise: A Future for Colleges.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1969.

Kerr, C. *The Urban-Grant University.* New York: The City College of New York, 1968.

Krathwohl, D.R., et al. *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives, Handbook II: Affective Domain.* New York: McKay, 1964.

Lawrence, Ben; Weathersby, George; and Patterson, Virginia, eds. *The Outputs of Higher Education: Their Proxies, Measurement and Evaluation.* Boulder, Colo.: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1970.

Lessinger, L.M. "Accountability in Public Education." In *Proceedings of the 1969 Invitational Conference on Testing Problems.* Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1970.

Lindvall, C.M., ed. *Defining Educational Objectives.* Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1964.

Luria, S.E. and Luria, Zella. "The Role of the University: Ivory Tower, Service Station, or Frontier Post." *Daedalus* 33, Winter 1970.

Mager, R.F. *Preparing Instructional Objectives.* Palo Alto, Calif.: Fearon, 1962.

March, J.G., ed. *Handbook of Organizations.* Chicago: Rand McNally, 1965.

Martin, W.B. *Conformity: Standards and Change in Higher Education.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1969.

Mayhew, L.B. *Colleges Today and Tomorrow.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1969.

McConnell, T.R. "The Function of Leadership in Academic Institutions." *Educational Record* 49, Spring 1968.

Millet, J.C. "Value Patterns and Power Conflict." In *Value Change and Power Conflict in Higher Education*, edited by W.J. Minter and Patricia O. Snyder. Boulder, Colo.: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1970.

Minter, W.J. and Thompson, I.M., eds. *Colleges and Universities as Agents of Social Change.* Boulder, Colo.: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1968.

_____ and Lawrence, B., eds. *Management Information Systems; Their Development and Use in the Administration of Higher Education.* Boulder, Colo.: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1969.

Mood, A.M. "Macro-analysis of the American Educational System." *Operations Research* 17, September-October 1969.

Nash, Patricia. "The Goals of Higher Education–An Empirical Assessment." Mimeographed. Columbia University: Bureau of Applied Social Research, June 1968.

Niblett, W.R., ed. *Higher Education: Demand & Response.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1970.

Norton, D.P. *The Governors State University Needs Survey.* Evanston, Ill.: Educational Testing Service, 1970.

Pace, C.R. "New Concepts in Institutional Goals for Students." In *The Liberal Arts College's Responsibility for the Individual Student,* edited by E.J. McGrath. New York: Teachers College Press, 1966.

Palola, E.; Lehmann, T.; and Blischke, W. *Higher Education by Design.* Berkeley: Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, 1970.

Perkins, J.A. *The University in Transition.* Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1966.

Perrow, C. "Goals in Complex Organizations." *American Sociological Review* 26, December 1961.

Peterson, R.E. "Reform in Higher Education–Demands of the Left and Right." *Liberal Education* 60, March 1969.

_____ et al. *Institutional Functioning Inventory; Preliminary Technical Manual.* Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1970.

Potter, V.R., et al. "Purpose and Function of the University." *Science* 168, March 20, 1970.

President's Commission on Higher Education. *Higher Education for American Democracy, Vol. I, Establishing the Goals.* Washington: Government Printing Office, 1947.

Price, J.L. *Organizational Effectiveness: An Inventory of Propositions.* Homewood, Ill.: Irwin, 1968.

"A Report: College Goals and Governance." *Danforth News and Notes.* St. Louis, Mo.: Danforth Foundation, November 1969.

Riesman, D. "The Collision Course of Higher Education." *The Journal of College Student Personnel* 10, November 1969.

Sanford, N., ed. *The American College.* New York: Wiley, 1962.

Schaar, J.H. "Reflections on Authority." In *New American Review, Number 8*, edited by T. Solotaroff. New York: New American Library, January 1970.

Schultz, T. "Resources for Higher Education: An Economist's View." *The Journal of Political Economy* 76, May/June 1968.

Simon, H. "On the Concept of an Institutional Goal." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 9, June 1964.

Smith, H. *The Purposes of Higher Education.* New York: Harper, 1955.

Stake, R.E. "Objectives, Priorities, and Other Judgment Data." *Review of Educational Research* 40, April 1970.

Suchman, E.A. *Evaluative Research,* New York: Russell Sage, 1967

Thompson, J.D. and McEwen, J. "Organizational Goals and Environment: Goal-setting as an Interaction Process." *American Sociological Review* 23, February 1958.

Thompson, J.D. *Organizations in Action.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967.

Thompson, V.A. *Modern Organization.* New York: Knopf, 1969.

Tyler, R.W., *Educational Evaluation: New Roles, New Means.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1969.

"U.S. Universities Don't Know What They're Doing or Why, Robert M. Hutchins Says." *Chronicle of Higher Education,* March 9, 1970, page 5.

Uhl, N. "A Technique for Improving Communication Within an Institution." In *Communication of Institutional Research: Proceedings of the Tenth Annual Forum,* edited by Patricia Wright. Association for Institutional Research, 1970.

Walton, J. *Administration and Policymaking in Education.* Baltimore: John Hopkins Press, 1959. (Especially Ch. IV, "The Discernment of Purpose.")

Wilson, L. "Setting Institutional Priorities." In *Learning and the Professors,* edited by O. Milton and E.J. Shoben. Athens, Ohio: Ohio University Press, 1968.

Wolff, R.P. *The Ideal of the University.* Boston: Beacon, 1969.

Yuchtman, E. and Seashore, S.E. "A System Approach to Organizational Effectiveness." *American Sociological Review* 32, December 1967.